

European Patent Office Receiving Office D-80298 MUNICH Germany

International application No.

Our ref

Our agent

PCT/EP2005/050701

P14079-M

Olle Lindberg/SFW

In response to the Written Opinion of 27 April 2006 in the above-referenced case, we hereby file amended claims 1-10. The following is put forward to the examiner.

Claim 1 as amended includes the subject matter of previous claims 1-3, but has been slightly re-worded for the sake of clarity. Doing so, all features considered to be essential by the examiner under paragraph 1.1, are now included in claim 1. The more clear definition of the invention as now provided in claim 1 also overcomes the objections raised in paragraph 1.2. The objection of clarity raised in paragraph 1.3 has been overcome where it is considered necessary. It should be noted, though, that the concept of a delta file as a means for updating software from one version to another is as such a well known term and concept.

By means of the invention as defined in claim 1, an entire software program may be updated with very limited extra memory space. Even though the program as such occupies a number of memory blocks, only one extra block is needed.

D1: EP 1120709 suggests a different solution, where the whole new (boot) program is written in a secondary location. In this solution, the memory therefore needs to hold two versions of the program. Claim 1 is therefore novel. Such a solution could be used also for firmware upgrade, but the memory requirements would be too high for many devices, such as mobile phones.

The objective problem solved by the invention is therefore to provide a method for updating software which does not require excessive memory space. With this objective at hand, the skilled person could turn to the method presented as state of the art in Fig. 1 of the present application, i.e. in place update. In that method, one block at a time is copied to a backup area before updating that memory block. However, there is nothing in D1 that would prompt the skilled person in the direction of the invention as defined in claim 1.

In fact, the solution to write the new program neither at a full size different location, nor at the same location with one block copied at a time, but stepwise moved one block up or down in the





memory, is very different from the solution of D1. It combines the advantages of reduced memory space requirement as offered by in place upgrade, and high speed of writing since data is never backed up. This effect is not obtained by D1, nor would it be obvious for the skilled person to modify the teachings of D1 into something that would fall within the scope of claim 1 when faced with the objective problem. Claim 1 must therefore be considered to involve an inventive step.

Independent claims 5 and 7 have been modified to be in conformity with amended claim 1, and the claims have been renumbered where appropriate. All amendments are evident from the enclosed marked-up copy.

Based on the above, we respectfully request that an IPRP stating the novelty and inventive step of claims 1-10.

Malmö, 6 July 2006

Sony Ericsson Molile Communications AB

By/

Olle Lindberg

European Patent Attorney
Direct No. +46 40-690 54 18

E-mail. olle.lindberg@albihns.se

Encs.

Amended claims 1-10

Marked-up copy of the claims

